DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 452 CS 209 410

AUTHOR Wells, Gordon; And Others
TITLE From Speech to Writing: Some Evidence on the Relationship between Oracy and Literacy from the Bristol Study "Language at Home and at School."
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Writing Convention (Norwich, England, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Child Development; Child Language; Cognitive Development; Developmental Stages; Family Influence; Individual Differences; *Integrated Activities; *Language Acquisition; *Language Research; *Language Role; *Oral Language; Primary Education; Speech Skills; Writing Evaluation; Writing Skills; *Written Language
IDENTIFIERS *Speaking Writing Relationship

ABSTRACT

Prepared as part of a British project investigating children's language at home and at school, the study described in this paper centered on an examination of the spoken and written narrative texts produced by children to determine (1) the relationship between spoken and written texts; (2) the differences, if any, in the production processes used in each; (3) the characteristics that most influenced raters in ranking the texts; and (4) whether the qualitative differences that led to the ranking of the texts as successful or unsuccessful were the result of individual differences or represented different stages in common sequences of development. The major portion of the paper consists of discussions of specific narrative samples that explain how and why each was rated successful or unsuccessful. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of the complex interrelationships between speech and writing and offers several implications of the study for teachers. Copies of student writing samples and of the writing prompt are appended. (FL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED266452

# FROM SPEECH TO WRITING: SOME EVIDENCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORACY AND LITERACY FROM THE BRISTOL STUDY 'LANGUAGE AT HOME AND AT SCHOOL'

**Gordon Wells, Gen Ling Chang and Jan Wells**

**Ontario Institute for Studies in Education**
**Toronto**

**August 1985**

Paper presented at the International Convention of Writing, Norwich, England, April 1985.

To appear in A. Wilkinson (ed.) forthcoming.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. G. Wells
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 209 410

# FROM SPEECH TO WRITING: SOME EVIDENCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORACY AND LITERACY FROM THE BRISTOL STUDY 'LANGUAGE AT HOME AND AT SCHOOL'

At first sight it might seem that, for children who have already succeeded in becoming competent speakers of their first language and who are growing up in a literate society, learning to write should be a relatively straight-forward extension of their means of linguistic communication. That being so, one would expect to find that those who were successful in one mode would be equally successful in the other. However, it is most teachers' experience that the transition from speech to writing is not made equally easily by all children, particularly in the early years of schooling and, amongst adults, we all know effective speakers who seem unable to put two sentences together in writing and fluent writers who seem to be tongue-tied when they are called upon to communicate their ideas in speech. It appears, therefore, that there is more to learning to write than simply acquiring the skills necessary for encoding speech in script. It is only quite recently, however, that the relationship between the two modes of communication has begun to be systematically investigated (Kroll and Vann, 1981; Tannen, 1982, 1984) and the variety of approaches that is being adopted is illustrated by other papers in this collection.

Unlike most of the other investigations reported here, however, the focus of the present study was not originally on writing or on the relationship between written and spoken language. It grew instead out of a more general longitudinal investigation of language development and of the relationship between language and educational achievement, in which a representative sample of 32 children was followed from the age of 15 months until the last year of their primary schooling (see Wells (1981, in press) for details). However, during the course of the study, a variety of samples of speech and writing were collected and in the most recent phase of the research we have begun to look at some of these in more detail.

At the last assessment, which was made when the children were aged 10 years 3 months, we asked each of them to carry out a number of tasks in speech and writing. Amongst the writing tasks there were two in a narrative genre: to make up a story to fit a cartoon showing a hunter with his dog, brought to bay at the edge of a cliff by a motley collection of animals (see Appendix 1) and to write a

personal narrative with the title The Happiest Day in my Life. Amongst the spoken tasks there was one that was roughly comparable to the second of the written tasks: in the course of an interview, each child was asked to describe a typical school day. It is the samples of speech and writing that were produced in response to these narrative tasks that will form the subject matter of this paper.

At the stage when we had been investigating the factors that were most influential in accounting for educational attainment at the end of the primary stage of education (Wells, Barnes and Wells, 1984), we had made a holistic assessment of the spoken and written texts, task by task. Five people had independently ranked all the texts (from which the writers' names had been removed) for each task and then a final rank order had been arrived at by consensus decision. While we were engaged in this task, we had become aware of a number of other questions that were raised by our procedure and by the material that we were assessing. In the present study, therefore, we decided to reexamine the narrative texts in order to find out:

- What are the characteristics that were most influential in accounting for the order in which the texts were ranked?
- What is the relationship between the spoken and written texts produced by individual children and how do the processes of production in the two modes differ?
- Are the qualitative differences between texts that had allowed us to rank the children from most to least successful as speakers and as writers merely the result of individual differences, or do they represent different stages in common sequences of development in the two modes?

The strategy that we actually followed was to look first at the written texts in order to attempt to answer the first and the third questions with respect to writing. The spoken texts were then considered in a similar manner. Finally, the two sets were compared in order to attempt an answer to the second question. The same sequence will be followed in this paper. The strategy will be to examine the texts of some half dozen of the children in detail and then to attempt to make some tentative generalizations, with the last section of the paper being given to a discussion of some of the issues raised by our findings.

**Analysing the Written Texts**

One of the most striking findings from the first, pre-school, phase of the Bristol Study was the strong evidence of a common developmental pattern in children's construction of the oral language system. Despite quite wide variation in their rate of development and in the quality of their

conversational experience, all the children went through essentially the same sequence in acquiring the options within the various linguistic systems investigated (Wells, 1985). Examining written language, Ferreiro (Ferreiro and Teberosky, 1982; Ferreiro, 1984) has also shown an impressive similarity between children from different cultures in the spontaneous development of their understanding of literacy. Although again at differing rates, children from a wide range of backgrounds showed the same progression in the hypotheses they constructed about the ways in which graphic substance is related to meaning and about the behaviours involved in reading and writing.

It seemed appropriate, therefore, to begin the present analysis of the written texts that we had collected by looking for evidence of common developmental patterns. Following Farmer and Dixon's (1981) example, we tried to assign each piece of writing to one of a sequence of 'staging points' in terms of what the writer had so far achieved and of the constraints under which he or she was working. This was partially successful, for it was immediately apparent that, although collected from children of identical age, the written texts spanned a wide range of maturity and could be differentiated in terms of their strengths and weaknesses. As the work proceeded, however, we found we wanted to systematize the distinctions we were making so we turned to some of the other recent research on writing for assistance. There seemed to be three main strands that had a bearing on our aims.

First, there have been investigations of the writing behaviours of mature writers. These studies have used various techniques for obtaining think-aloud protocols in order to discover what aspects of the task are being attended to at various points in the total writing process (e.g. Flower and Hayes, 1981). From this work has come the recognition that it is necessary to distinguish a number of different dimensions, to which the writer attends at different times in what Flower and Hayes (1980) refer to as a 'juggling of constraints'. In his account of his own writing processes, Smith (1982) makes a broad two-way distinction between the dimensions of 'composition' and 'transcription', the former being concerned with the retrieval and organization of the ideational content and its formulation in a linear sequence and the latter with the conversion of this sequence into a conventionally presented graphic display. Others have made a greater number of distinctions, as for example in the following diagram from Beaugrande (1982).

Figure 1. A Parallel-Stage Interaction Model (from Beaugrande, 1982)

However, what all these writers emphasize is that, although the dimensions that they distinguish can be thought of as hierarchically organized, they receive attention not serially - as is often suggested by instructional texts - but cyclically and perhaps even simultaneously. Revision, in particular, is seen to be integrally involved in this cyclical process, not just carried out as a separate activity, once the first draft has been completed.

The second strand of research has had a more developmental focus, and it too has been based on observations of writers at work (Bissex, 1980; Clay, 1975; Goodman, 1984; Graves, 1982; Harste et al., 1984; Nicholls, 1984; Vygotsky, 1978). In many of these studies, considerable attention has been given to the systematic procedures which children develop for mapping meaning on to graphic substance. Nevertheless, all of these writers are unanimous in emphasizing that even the youngest writers are also wrestling with problems of content and organization.

However, goal-directed planning is rare in young writers, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1985) suggest, not merely because their attention is largely absorbed by the as yet unroutinized tasks of handwriting and spelling, but also because they are still in the process of making the transition from dependence on inputs from a conversational partner to the ability to compose autonomously. In this transition period, their basic strategy, it is suggested, is one of 'knowledge telling', that is to say the generation of text in response to the simple self-prompt 'What next?'. However, the lack of goal-directed planning which these authors report may owe more to the unfamiliar demands placed on the children by the kind of tasks in which they were asked to engage than to a general inability to plan

when writing.

Many students of children's writing have noticed that they have a decided preference for the narrative mode. Whilst this may often be partly attributable to adult suggestion, Wilkinson et al. (1980) suggest that the tendency is more fundamental in origin and this interpretation is supported by such writers as Britton (1983) and Meek (1985). If narrative is 'a primary act of mind', as Hardy (1968) suggests, stories may indeed be the most 'natural' genre for children to work in, and with the benefit of a well-understood narrative structure to help them with the higher level planning, some children are capable of writing effective and well organized stories as early as seven years of age (Wilkinson et al., 1980).

A third important strand of research, therefore, concerns the development of children's understanding of story (Applebee, 1978) and the application of ideas derived from work on 'story grammars' to the investigation of children's writing (Kroll and Anson, 1983). Because children encounter stories in spoken as well as in written form, however, story grammars can also provide a tool for the study of children's spoken and retold stories (Wade, 1981) and for comparisons between the two modes.

Much of the research referred to above includes observations of writers in the process of writing as well as analyses of the resulting products. In our case, however, we had only the evidence provided by the texts themselves. In constructing the model to be used in the analysis of the texts, therefore, we had to draw rather selectively on previous work. The final scheme distinguished four dimensions, each subsuming a number of further categories as shown in Figure 2.

Substance

*Handwriting, Spelling, Punctuation*

Form

*Vocabulary, Grammar*

Producer Surface text

Content

*Ideation, Affective/Moral stance*

Rhetorical Goals

*Awareness of reader, Overall purpose*

Figure 2. Model for the Analysis of Children's Written Texts

Before moving to a consideration of some of the actual texts, a few comments about the model as a whole are required. First, although designed for the analysis of finished products, it is clear that, as one moves through the model from 'substance' to 'rhetorical goals', the categories become progressively more process-oriented. However, we feel justified in claiming that it is not only think-aloud protocols but also the resulting written texts that can provide evidence concerning the processes involved in written production.

Secondly, we must express some hesitation about the allocation of the categories to the four main dimensions. Selections from the resources of vocabulary and grammar, for example, operate together at the level of form to express the content that the writer chooses to communicate. About the appropriate location for punctuation, however, we must acknowledge some uncertainty. Like intonation, to which it partially corresponds, it is not clear whether it should not more properly be put under 'form' than under 'substance'. The justification for including it under the latter, together with spelling and handwriting is that, in its realisation as a set of conventional symbols, it is specific to the graphic medium in very much the same way as spelling.

A further point that we wish to emphasize is that we do not conceive of these dimensions as prescribing a temporal sequence (from bottom to top) through which writing should proceed. Still less do we believe that writers actually follow such a sequence. How a writer starts is likely to vary from one writer to another and from one occasion to another and so is the distribution of the writer's attention as the task proceeds. Problems can arise at every level, as is suggested by the points at which writers pause with concentrated attention and by the revisions that they sometimes make before proceeding. More of the young writer's attention must undoubtedly be given to the dimensions of substance and form than is the case with expert writers, but we should assume that, like the expert, he or she moves between all the dimensions as the demands of the developing text require.

However, what distinguishes the young writer from the expert is the constraints that problems on one dimension may place upon successful operation at the others. Uncertainty about the correct spelling of a particular word, for example, can lead to the selection of an 'easier' alternative and the trains of thought called up by the word chosen can have repercussions on every other dimension. To some extent, of course, such constraints may be instructionally induced: if correct spelling is not made an issue, for example, the need to restrict oneself to words that one can spell disappears.

Finally, a point about ideation. For the texts that we are about to consider, ideation can be thought of as being concerned chiefly with narrative structure and the generation of appropriate content to fit the overall plan for the story - to the extent that such a plan is being developed. Included here also is characterization and other devices that enrich the story beyond the bare skeleton. With other genres of writing, other structures would be required, but these will not concern us here. It is worth noting, however, that for young writers there is a major difference between the narrative genre and almost all others in that, for most children, the basic narrative structure is already familiar from their experience of having stories told or read to them and from their own reading and is therefore fairly readily available when they come to write. In most other genres, by contrast, the appropriate structure has to be created as part of the act of writing. It is probably for this reason that most children write more easily and at greater length when composing a narrative than they do when working in any other genre.

**The Evidence from the Narrative Samples**

Let us start with Rosie, to see what is achieved by the lowest ranked of our 32 writers.[1]

Rosie

[Insert Text 1 here]

The intention to write a story is signalled by the opening phrase, 'once upon a time' and, although brief, her story has a conventional closing in 'the end'. Beyond that, however, there is little that could be called a narrative, as she does not get beyond the introduction of some of the protagonists, using the simple active affirmative declarative form to state their location. There is some attempt at variation in the linking, '*but* there is a elephant', but the significance of this, if any, never becomes apparent.

In this sample Rosie's spelling is conventional, but this can be attributed to the fact that most of the words were spelled on the picture provided. Her account of The Happiest Day is less successful from this point of view, showing that, without support, she has not yet reached the stage of phonetic spelling, ('Boon' for 'book', 'fat' for 'for'), nor is she fully consistent, as she spells 'Christmas' without an

---

[1] References to the children's ranks on the various tasks, both spoken and written, are based on the holistic assessments that were made of the texts in the previous phase of the research, referred to above, p.00

'r' on the second occasion. Neither piece has any punctuation and the handwriting is very immature, with some letters poorly formed and the spacing irregular.

[Insert Text 2 here]

There are achievements, but it would appear that the labour involved in the very act of writing (her letter formation suggests that she has great difficulty in the creation of recognizably conventional graphic substance), means that she can give very little attention to the selection and shaping of material in order to meet a higher level goal.

Jason

[Insert Text 3 here]

Jason's story contains a number of events, all relating to the principal character, the hunter. There is also a brief introduction and a form of resolution: 'We don't know what happened to the hunter'. This does not add up to a very satisfactory story but, compared with Rosie's attempt, this is considerably more mature, with some variety in the sentence structure (e.g. 'He was being chased') and a linking with 'and so'. In his Happiest Day we find the same characteristics and, in addition, an explicit attempt to explain why he was happy: 'because I can do jumps on it (the bike)'.

[Insert Text 4 here]

However, the over-riding impression is still of the difficulty that he experiences with the written substance, indicated in his case by the awkwardness of the handwriting and the number of crossings out. The spelling, too, although more recognisably phonetic than Rosie's, suggests that he has some difficulty in matching letters to sounds: 'The hunter fired a pulet (bullet) but it was fuld with blags (blanks)'. The punctuation, on the other hand, shows that he is able to identify the major meaning boundaries and, in the Hunter story, all the sentences begin with a capital letter and most end with a full stop.

Nancy

One hot afternow Professor forget-Me-Not set of on a long long long larny frow the jungle. He tack his rifall got on his elephant and set of frow the Afreky Jungle. Afte one nite and one day he came-two a spout were he cond make camp as he was camping on top of the clift a grop of anemals came along and fietad Professor forget-Me-Nots dog bones at thiss he ran up two the clift pratale nocking the Professor of the clift. The anemals became fens with the Professor and his dog bones the name the animals Jombow the elephant and wochout the Draft and hisn the snake and Toby Leftbehid. Shell and hard-shell the tortoises and beeky

and mij the Baird and Gody the lion. and warm rine the rhinocero.

The elephant Jombow taken the professor and his dog aroad the Jugell he take spesamins of places and fings like hat after a muthe with them he had two go back two england two his famie but he did not want two go bake with out them. So he said will you come back two england So they agreed two go with him.

This story was ranked only one higher than Jason's, yet it is in many ways very much superior. Apart from the digression in which the animals are named - and even this adds a humorous flavour - there is a clear story line with the events in the later part clearly motivated by those that precede. There is also a satisfying resolution. Sentence structure is varied and anaphoric pronouns are used appropriately.

Nancy's Happiest Day (not quoted in full) shows some of the same achievements. It starts well: 'On Saturday 22th May 19.82 Was the day two rember in my Famly For it was my sister's weding two be marid two Richard.' In what follows, there is a tendency for the 'and then' strategy to take over, but there is considerable detail, as in the following sentences: 'When we got home we had a samewig two eat then we had a wosh and cleed are teeth then we got chage When we got down stern's the driver of the car was wateing for us so we went strate in two the car and two the chaner (church)'.

Both pieces, in fact, make quite interesting reading. So why was Nancy ranked so low? There can be no certainty about the answer but a probable explanation is to be found in the spelling. Both pieces are relatively long and quite neatly and legibly printed. They are only difficult to read if one is put off by the unconventionality of the spelling. This is certainly a constraint as far as the reader is concerned although, judging by the length and fluency of both pieces, the writer did not find this a problem. However, in the context of an assessment of educational attainment it is perhaps not surprising that such unconventional spelling was judged to be a serious flaw.

Abigail

Help!

"He,s going to fall off the edge of the cliff" murmured all the animals. "Serves him right for almost killing us" said Leo the lion. "I think he was quite nice" said mussels the monkey "you would" said Ricky the rhinoceros "I don,t know why you are called mussels your such a softy." "Don,t be so mean Ricky" said Avril the elephant "he used to be very strong". "You lot ssstop nattering on he,s going to fall" said silly snake. "Look he,s..... "Hellllp" ....falling",said Torpedo the tortoise.

The judges had considerable difficulty in ranking Abigail's story. It seems that its achievements simultaneously constrain the overall effect. More than any other child in the group, she dramatises

the situation and, both through the names given to them and in what they say, she succeeds in creating distinct animal characters. The control of punctuation is well developed (apart from the unconventional placing of the apostrophe) and she exploits other features of the graphic substance to good effect. The choice of vocabulary is interesting and apt for the dramatized argument, and she uses - perhaps overuses - an appropriate syntactic structure for the same purpose.

But is there a story? On this point the judges were in serious disagreement. Whatever answer one gives to this question, however, there is certainly no explanation of the scene depicted in the cartoon and little by way of development of it. And the reason, in this case, seems to be that almost all the writer's attention was taken up by her impressive achievement in representing the animals' argument. By attempting to use the relatively unfamiliar dramatic mode rather than the more familiar narrative mode, she had given herself additional problems to solve and, on this occasion, did not manage to cope with all these demands simultaneously.

We get a better idea of the range of Abigail's achievement as a writer by looking at the other, more personal, narrative.

> The happiest moment in my life.
>
> We were going to go on holiday round a little bit of Europe. Instead of going through France and into Spain we were going round through France into Germany then into Austria where we would stay in in a small Austrian farm house for 4 days. After that we would move on to Italy there we stayed in a newly built hotel with only 10 other people staying there. Just across the road was a lake where we could swim or hire a surf sail or float or paddle in our small rubber dinghy it was absolutely sensational just swimming in fresh water. But the only sad thing there was a thunder storm every evening in Italy. But then we had to turn back to go home such a sad thing when you are having fun.

The structure of this piece is much more apparent: an introduction to set the scene (presented with impressive control of the future-in-the-past tense), a detailed description of the climax of the holiday which vividly conveys her pleasure, and a generalization to form a conclusion which contrastively recalls the title. This is clearly 'literary' writing, and consciously so. The choice of tenses is one indication, the list of alternative pleasures and the somewhat moralistic conclusion are others. Interestingly, though, her control of punctuation is less secure in this piece and, as in the first, we notice the absence of commas and paragraphing. In fact, only one of the children either used commas or organized his writing in paragraphs.

Abigail's two pieces were very differently evaluated. The first was ranked seventeenth and the

second tenth. The latter rank comes closer to her teacher's assessment of her ability as a writer and perhaps, if the judges had been assessing the children as writers rather than the individual texts, they would have been inclined to give her credit for the versatility she displays in tackling the two narrative tasks in such different ways. Certainly, the comparison is instructive in reminding us - if such a reminder is needed - of the danger of making an assessment of a child on a single piece of writing.

In Abigail's case, the probable reason for the relative lack of success on the story of the hunter has already been suggested: a preoccupation with what was probably a newly-acquired technical skill in punctuation combined with an attempt to write in a relatively unfamiliar genre. But there are many other factors that contribute to the level of success achieved on any particular occasion - not least the extent to which the writer is able to take a topic which is assigned and develop a personal commitment to it. Bereiter (pers. comm.) argues that it is one of the marks of a skilled writer that he or she can manage to do a workman-like job under the topic-assigned condition, but for the novice writer this is a constraint that may severely limit what is achieved.

Samantha

The Angry Animals

Once there was an old scientist he was walking through Jungle When he thought about how he was going to get back he could not remember the way he came. Neither could the dog. 'I thought a dog was a mans best friend' said the old scientist. So they were lost. Soon it got very dark So they spent the night uner a tree. The next morning he and dog were very hungry and they saw the monkeys eating bananas the lions eating meat witch would be very nice cooked. The elephants drinking cool clean freash water from the river. everywhere they looked they saw animals eating things It made him feel very hungry indeed so he frightend all the elephants away from the river with his shot gun firing It into the air The dog chased them away as well. He pinched the meat from the lion that Made him very Angry so he chased him the old scientist ran and ran as fast as his legs could carry him he ran so fast that he lost the lion running through the long grass. He pinched the bananas from the monkeys that made them so mad they started running up and down the trees jumping and swinging on the branches and also screaming there heads off it was so loud and it made a terrible racket. He had pinched all the food and drink that he had seen. The dog and the scientist lit a fire And made a cosy bed of long grass and had a magnificent feast. All of the animals were so mad they crowded around the scientist and the dog and chased them to a cliff they got nearer and near 'Cant you do something dog' said the scientist 'you are usless' then the dog started barking the loudest he could and all the animals fled every where they were safe. They found there way back and the scientist was very pleased 'Well maybe your not so useless after all' he said with a smile.

This was one of the longest pieces of writing we received and it illustrates why teachers so often equate length with quality, particularly in the early stages. Greater length gives scope for a more

interesting development of the topic. But what is impressive about this story is the clear evidence of planning. The animals' attack on the scientist and his dog is a response to having their food stolen and the stealing of the food was prompted by the protagonists seeing the animals eating when they were themselves hungry which, in turn, was a consequence of their getting lost in the jungle. Samantha achieves a sustained narrative structure, with several well developed episodes, all of which must have been planned, at least in outline, before she began to write. This is underlined by the second thread that runs through the story: the dog's initial failure to live up to its reputation as man's best friend and then its final vindication.

In addition to the overall effect, there are other achievements on all dimensions in the proposed descriptive model. The hunter is characterized as 'an old scientist' and it is his explicit response to his initial predicament which motivates the train of events that leads to the climax. The temporal sequence of events is clearly marked with such phrases as 'it got dark', 'the next morning'; causal links are similarly made explicit. Sentence structure is varied, and dependent and relative clauses are used to add detail and to convey the protagonist's thoughts, e.g. 'the lions eating meat *which would be very nice cooked*'. The choice of vocabulary goes beyond the obvious ('cool clean fresh water', 'cosy bed', 'magnificent feast') and there are a number of colloquial phrases, such as 'they were so mad that..', 'screaming their heads off' and 'a terrible racket', that add considerably to the evocation of the animals' angry response to the theft of their food.

Her Happiest Day showed many of the same qualities.

> The happiest moment in my life is when I went to Majorca last year. We stayed in a little village called portals Nouse it was a quiet village with a lovely beach on sunny days we used to walk along the road to the beach there was a restaurant & a Super market. We used to sit on the beach & every day a man used to come to the beach & throw Grapes at you he sold fruit & one day I had half of a pineapple. We went snorkelling & the water was so clear you could see the rocks & fish there were some pedilos and We Went out for a ride every day. The sun was shineing all the time and the food in the hotel was beautiful it was wondeful in Majorca.

Overall, the account is well structured. The moment is clearly situated - a holiday in a Majorcan village. A number of enjoyable activities are described with interesting details, such as the throwing of grapes, and the water being so clear that the rocks and fishes could be seen. The piece concludes with two more general statements and a summary that reiterates the main theme of a happy experience.

There are limitations in both pieces of writing, of course: an erratic use of punctuation and occasional unconventional spelling. But these are infelicities that might have been corrected on a rereading, if there had been an opportunity. Certainly, these stories vindicate those who argue with Smith (1982) that, where 'composition' and 'transcription' are competing for attention, it is more important to concentrate first on solving problems of composition. Samantha's two pieces of writing were both ranked number five.

Jonathan

The final child to be considered is, in the opinion of most of the judges, already a competent writer. Consider, first, his account of his happiest day.

> The Happiest Moment of my Life
>
> The happiest moment of my life was as I bit into a rich, meaty cornish pasty after a day's weary travelling (at least that was what it seemed like) and a week's holiday of golden sands, ice creams and sun stretched out before me. We were camping on a quiet grassy hill, hill especially. I felt that nothing could be better. I was right.

Jonathan was not unique amongst the children in the sample in showing an awareness of the reader through the use of 'asides' ('at least that was what it seemed like') but he was certainly unique in his ability to marshal his resources in a sustained manner to achieve a deliberate and concentrated effect. The achievements are too numerous to catalogue, but particularly worthy of attention is the construction of the first sentence, in which the moment of biting into the pasty is seen as a hilltop, from which the writer looks back down one side to the past, to the weary travelling, and forward down the other side to the pleasures stretched out before him. It is also notable that, as the title suggests, he does select a particular moment - that of the first bite into the pasty. Equally effective is the contrast between this long first sentence and the two short final ones.

His story of the hunter was equally short - too short in the opinion of at least one of the judges. But it too stands out as being distinctly and almost self-consciously literary in its conception.

> "Where's the Ark?'
>
> Noah twisted his fingers awkwardly behind his back as the animals stared at him.
>
> "But how *can* you forget to build an ark?"asked the giraffe. "I left a lovely field of juicy worms to come here" chirped a bird indignantly. "I demand compensation!"
>
> Meanwhile Noah was slowly walking backwards, and eventually fell off the cliff. Luckily he fell on a wooden raft. "Good old Noah!" yelled the animals, and dived on with him.

The story is indeed somewhat short and the author more than a little whimsical in his

anachronistic interpretation of the cartoon. But neither of those signs of irreverence detracts from the achievements of the writing. Once again, it is sufficient to consider just the first two sentences. The sense of a predicament is achieved immediately through the phrase 'twisted his hands awkwardly behind his back' and, with 'the animals stared at him', a feeling of suspense is created, which is resolved in the unexpected question by the giraffe. In this same question, there is a different sort of sophistication in the use of italic script to represent the spoken emphasis on 'can'.

But the most interesting feature of the whole story is its inter-textuality - the assumption that the reader will recall the biblical story of Noah and understand the giraffe's incredulity that Noah should have forgotten to build an ark. For a ten-year-old to manage the literary allusion with such assurance is, in our opinion, an indication not only of his outstanding ability as a writer but also of the richness of his personal literary experience.

**Some tentative generalizations about the development of narrative writing**

Although the number of samples in the previous section is small, those that were considered are sufficient to demonstrate the very great range of ability that one finds amongst a representative group of ten-year-olds. What is more, even from these six children one gets a sense of a developmental progression, which is reinforced by examining the two types of narrative produced by all the 32 children. At the same time, however, one also gets a sense of diversity in the areas in which children demonstrate strengths and weaknesses. Nancy's control of narrative structure, for example, is considerably in advance of her ability to control the conventions of transcription, whilst Abigail demonstrates a skill in handling form and substance which - at least in the Hunter text - outstrips her ability to develop an effective overall structure.

The tentative conclusion we would draw from this analysis, therefore, is that there is no simple linear sequence of development that is followed by all children. The differing emphases in the teaching that they receive would seem to be responsible for a considerable proportion of the variation in individual children's profiles; for example, whether they are encouraged to concentrate on developing the content, using whatever transcriptional resources they have available, or whether they are expected to develop fluent handwriting and conventional spelling through copying the teacher's model before they embark on independent composition of their own stories but with continued close monitoring of the skills of transcription. The latter is certainly the more traditional approach and, in

the present study, Abigail represents a child who has been influenced by it. By contrast, an emphasis on composition first is the approach advocated by Graves (1982) and Harste et al. (1984) in the United States; in their view, children who are encouraced to focus on composition and to experiment with the graphic system of representing meaning and to 'invent' their own spelling will develop progressively more adult-like hypotheses about the conventions of transcription without the need for an insistence on instruction and practice. Probably few of the teachers who had taught the children in our study would have been entirely comfortable with the latter approach, but many would have agreed that too great an insistence on 'correctness' would be likely to interfere with creativity in the setting of goals and the selection of content. Both Nancy and Samantha seem to be children who have been encouraged to take risks in the interests of creating stories that would be interesting to read.

The point here, however, is not to argue the relative merits of the various approaches to the teaching of writing - important though it is to be clear about the theoretical grounds on which those approaches are based and about their probable consequences - but to recognize that some of the differences between children in their achievements and in the factors which constrain them are likely to have a pedagogical cause. However, there are other differences that seem to call for a different sort of explanation, in particular the more global differences that were reflected in the relative rankings that the pieces of writing received. This issue will be returned to in the following section.

First, however, let us return to the question of a developmental sequence. Even if there is little support for a single linear sequence, it is still possible that, within some or all of the categories that are associated with each of the dimensions, there is a developmental progression. On the basis of our analysis of these samples of writing, we think there is, and in Appendix 2 we have set out, for each of the categories identified in Figure 2, our best estimate as to what that progression is. Space does not allow us to defend this proposal here and, in any case, being based only on a relatively small cross-section of children writing in response to topics that they had not themselves proposed, the suggestion, it must be emphasized, is extremely tentative. However, it will form the basis for a new longitudinal investigation that we are about to embark on, one of the aims of which is to put it to the test and either reject or modify and develop it.

The first of our initial questions we can answer with more confidence. What, we wanted to know, were the factors most influential in accounting for the order in which the samples of writing were

ranked? The first approach we took to answering this question was quantitative in nature and focussed on the level of form. However the results can be briefly stated. None of the measures of syntactic structure - length or complexity - was significantly correlated with the judges' rank order. Frequency of use of clauses of reported speech, on the other hand, was related to rank order on the accounts of both the Happiest Day (written) and the School Day (oral). An evaluation of vocabulary, in terms of the proportion of words selected that are relatively infrequently used, also showed a positive relationship between a greater use of less common words and the rank assigned to the text (Wells et al. 1984). Both positive results were tentatively interpreted as indicating that what the judges were responding to was not complexity or correctness of linguistic form *per se* but the effective selection from these resources to fulfill the demands of the tasks in an effective manner.

This interpretation was confirmed by the qualitative examination of the narrative texts described above, from which it was clear that it was the effectiveness with which the children had written a narrative that best predicted the rankings assigned by the judges. Effective control of linguistic form contributed to this judgement - appropriate use of tenses and temporal adverbials to relate the events within the narrative, the use of cohesion to achieve coherence without simple repetition and the selection of vocabulary items that particularized events, characters and their motives and feelings. But it was the extent to which the children managed the dimensions of ideation and rhetorical goals to which the greatest weight was given.

Few of the children showed evidence of deliberately attempting to achieve a rhetorical goal other than that of writing a narrative of the kind specified by the task. Jonathan was an obvious exception and there were one or two others who introduced humour, often through asides to the reader. There was also relatively little evidence of an affective or moral stance to the content of the narratives, although most of the children were able to convey their response to the events that made up their happiest day, either explicitly or implicitly through what they chose to write about. In the story of the hunter, too, quite a high proportion described their protagonist's response to his predicament and, in some of the more effective stories, this response motivated much of the subsequent action.

However, the description of the protagonist's response to his situation brings us to a consideration of narrative structure, of which, according to Mandler and Johnson (1977), it is an essential component.

> The essential structure of a single episode story is that a protagonist is introduced in the setting, there follows an episode in which something happens, causing the protagonist to respond to it, which in turn brings about some event or state of affairs that ends the episode. The simplest story must have at least four propositions, representing a setting, beginning, development, and ending, if it is to be considered a story. (p.119)

Kroll, who was the originator of the narrative tasks used in this study, applied a story-grammar analysis to the samples of writing produced by a group of nine-year-old children from the Bristol study and reported that this approach failed to discriminate adequately between the stories he examined (Kroll and Anson, 1983). In the present investigation, however, with a less complicated version of the model, we found a good fit between management of the narrative structure and the judges' rankings. This was particularly true in the case of the Hunter story, less so in the account of the Happiest Day. In the former, the minimum four-part narrative structure was used by 24 of the 32 children and 21 of these were assigned ranks between 1 and 23. Abigail was one of the two children in these 23 judged not to have met this criterion and, as already noted, the task she set herself was somewhat different. Quite a number of children went beyond the minimum of one episode and either recounted a sequence of related episodes leading to a climax and resolution (Samantha) or, in a few cases, nested one episode inside another. These children were, in general, judged to have written more successful stories.

Other features of narrative structure that were noted in the stories of those children judged to be more successful were:

* an extended description of the setting, using clearly visualized detail, e.g. 'It was a plesant day in North Africa. Filthy Menasty was making another trap to capture wild animals. He was doing this to make the biggest zoo in the whole world'(Tony).

* the use of reported speech and, in some cases, sustained dialogue (Abigail).

* characterization, either through a description of the externally apparent features of the protagonist (Nancy) or through revealing the protagonist's inner state (Samantha, Jonathan).

* making one or other of the forms of characterization motivate the events of the story (Samantha, Jonathan).

Significantly, 6 of the 8 most highly ranked Hunter stories displayed this last feature, together with one or more of the others. In sum, at least as far as the five judges were concerned, it was the ability to plan and compose an interesting and well-constructed story, as evidenced by the final product, that was the most important criterion for success in narrative writing.

**The relationship between speech and writing**

The issue we wish to explore in this next section was clearly posed more than a decade ago by Connie and Harold Rosen. As they put it: 'to understand what kinds of problems young children face when they write we have to work out in what ways speaking (which they do very well) and writing (which is new to them) differ' (1973: 267). Since then, there have been a number of insightful investigations which bear on this problem from perspectives ranging from the anthropological (Goody, 1977) and sociological (Gumperz and Gumperz, 1981) to the psychological (Olson, 1977) and linguistic (Chafe, 1982). All emphasize that more is involved than a change in the channel (oral/aural, manual/visual) through which the linguistic messages are expressed. In moving between spoken and written language, the nature of the message itself changes, in response to the different purposes that the two linguistic modes usually serve and to the inter- and intra-personal contexts in which they are typically used. Writing is not simply speech written down.

The truth of this is confirmed by any study which follows children's linguistic development beyond the first one or two years at school. Undoubtedly, for the beginning writer/reader, it is indeed the substance of the new medium that most demands attention. For on entry to school, as Rosen and Rosen point out, children have already achieved considerable control over the resources of the spoken language of their community and, under appropriate conditions, the strategies they have developed for negotiating meanings as listeners and speakers carry the majority of them through the initial stages of establishing the correspondences between the substance of speech and the substance of writing until the processes often referred to as coding and decoding are firmly established for writing as well as for speech. By ten years of age, however, having had five years of apprenticeship, the necessary skills should be more or less mastered. But, for most of them, writing still remains as difficult as ever. The reason, of course, is that the major differences between speaking and writing lie not so much in the selections of form and substance in which meanings are realised as in the manner in which the meanings are conceptualized and structured (Martlew, 1983).

Part of the problem that writers experience, as Olson (1977) and Bereiter and Scardamalia (1982a) have, from their different perspectives, made clear, is to be found in the different strategies for text production that are necessary when the support of a conversational partner is withdrawn. Under these conditions, the major responsibility for sustaining the flow and connectedness of the text is placed firmly on the producer. However, since sustained text production can occur in both speech and writing, the important comparison for our purposes is not that between writing and conversation but

that between what we shall call written and oral 'monologue'. We should therefore look more closely at similarities and differences between texts produced in these two conditions. As a first step in this direction, we shall compare the spoken and written personal narratives produced by just four of the children we have already met.

First, the tasks. The written task has already been described: to write an account of My Happiest Day. The oral task was embedded in an interview between the individual child and a member of the research team and was tape recorded with the child's knowledge. The purpose of the interview was twofold: to obtain information about the child's home environment, as he or she perceived it, and about his impressions of school and simultaneously to obtain a sample of the child's spontaneous speech. In all parts of the interview, the researcher encouraged the child to give extended answers and, once a question had been asked, support was reduced to a minimum level of attentive gaze and the occasional acknowledgement. In planning the interview, it was decided in advance to use the response to the request to describe a typical school day to provide the speech sample on which to base various measures of oral language ability.

However, the decision to use this sample of speech for the specific purpose of a direct comparison between oral and written narratives was not taken until after all the interviews had been carried out, by which time it was too late to attempt to match the tasks more closely. A different request, such as to describe the most frightening experience the child had ever had, for example, would have posed demands more similar to those of the written task. Nevertheless, despite the less than perfect match, there are sufficient similarities between the two tasks in their requirement that the child produce a sustained narrative monologue to justify making a comparison between the resulting oral and written texts.

Rosie

Rosie's Happiest Day, it will be recalled, was extremely short, consisting of only two sentences with almost identical structure:

at christmas my mum bought me a bag
at christmas my mum bought me a wireless and a colouring book

There is no narrative structure and the relevance of the content to the title is left entirely implicit.

Her School Day, on the other hand, while shorter than most of the other children's, still contains

considerably more information than her written text.[2]

1 When I goes to school .. I either gets told off . or gets
2 smacked (laughs) ... or sometimes I gets . picked on by all
3 the rest of them . or sometimes it's either me who's getting
4 - it's either - or it's either .. Sandy . the one who sits
5 next to me .. sometime Sandy . gets it .....
6 I don't have dinners no more .....
7 I used to get picked on . in this class .... and when I used
8 to go up - when I used to go up - go somewhere for Miss .
9 I used to go - I used to go 'silly cow' .. 'cos I don't like
10 our teacher . I never like that teacher ..
11 Three - three time - three years I've been in that school ..
12 And then at home time we got to put our chairs up ...
13 And then when we gets at home we got to have - we either has
14 chips . what our ma cooks . or either . we goes up the shops
15 and then - we goes up the shops to get it .
16 And then when we g- we goes to - and when - and we goes to
17 bed . me and Donna used to play cards until our ma comes up ....
18 Don't know what else to say.

As with her handwriting, Rosie's speech in this situation lacks fluency but, once the listener has overcome that problem, it is relatively easy to pick out the main episodes. From 12 onwards, these follow the chronological sequence of the day. The principle on which these episodes are selected for mention (with the possible exception of 12) seems to be their significance for the narrator, although this is, quite reasonably, not made explicit. They are clearly based on specific occasions but offered as instances of the sort of things that happen on a typical school day.

It is noticeable that none of the events mentioned is connected with the official purpose of schooling. Instead, in that part of the account where some mention of lessons might be expected, she gives her emotional response to her experience at school, with a quite explicit statement of her feelings about the teacher.

Viewed in terms of the model proposed for the description of writing, we might say that Rosie's achievements in this text include features at the level of ideation - explicit expression of affective response, action motivated by that response (9) and, at the level of rhetorical goals, an aside, motivated by awareness of the listener's needs (4-5). The constraints are a lack of fluency, an intermittent and only partial control of narrative structure and, most conspicuously, an apparent absence of any overall plan. Nevertheless, compared with her written narrative, this is a much more successful attempt.

---

[2]The lines are numbered for ease of reference. Periods mark pauses, with the number of periods corresponding to the number of seconds of noticeable silence. '-' indicates a false start

Jason

Jason's written account of his Happiest Day (p. 00) was also short but, in its capturing of a particular moment, it demonstrates a number of achievements. In three sentences, he locates the moment - when he got his bike - specifies what sort of bike and then gives the reason for his happiness. If one ignores the limitations of form and substance, there is coherence in this brief account, although little elaboration.

His oral account contains much more information.

1 Oh - I wake up in the morning and .. and I used to get - I get up
2 Huh I goes - I - I used to go downstairs . get dressed
3 This was in our other - old house
4 So I used to . get up get dressed go - go downstairs and have my
5 breakfast near the fire .
6 Then I used to go to school .....
7 I - I used to go to school ... probably have a f- 'nother fight . and
8 *Interviewer:Probably have what?*
9 Another fight *Interviewer:All right Carry on ...*
10 And in - in the dinner hour I prob- probably got sent to the
11 headmistress again . and then do - do some . p- um pick -
12 some . work got to - got to go back to the headmistress get a -
13 a sort of star ..
14 And then ... I used . to come home play on my bike for a bit .
15 down the park . I used to - I used to sneak down - I used to sneak
16 down the bottom bit of the park .
17 And then . then um . I used to come in h- . have a bath and then
18 go to bed

The narrative follows chronological sequence throughout and goes from getting up to going to bed. As with Rosie, there is no mention of school work and most of the account is taken up with what happens outside the school. What is particularly interesting in this piece is, after the first utterance, the consistent use of the past tense and frequent use of the marker of habitual aspect 'used to'. In line 3, this is explained: his account applies to a period in the past, when he lived at 'the old house'. The inclusion of this aside shows awareness of his listener's needs. However, several other events are not explained, such as why he had a fight and what was so interesting about the bottom bit of the park. Some interesting details are introduced, such as 'breakfast near the fire', receiving 'a sort of star' and 'sneaking down to the bottom bit of the park'. What is clear from these brief comments is that, despite the rather frequent disfluencies, there are achievements at all levels, even though, in the selection of information for inclusion, there is little evidence of an overall plan.

For children like Rosie and Jason, then, the request for a narrative monologue in the oral mode

enables them to display achievements that are apparently out of their reach in the written mode. At the same time it must be recognized that, even in the oral mode, their skills of composition are severely limited.

Samantha and Jonathan

When we come to consider the more successful communicators, Samantha and Jonathan, the situation is somewhat different. Given the more discursive nature of oral monologue, both succeed in giving a well-organized account of a typical school day and both provide specific details to give interest to their accounts. (For reasons of space, it is impossible to quote these texts in full.) Samantha walks to school: 'We have to take a slow walk up and there's this sweet shop and I go in usually and get some chewing gums or bubble gums.' Jonathan, first thing: 'I usually manage to find some excuse or other for staying in for five minutes. For example Sovereign's there on top of me. That's our dog (laughing)". In describing what goes on in school, both give examples of lessons and, interestingly, both offer comments on the examples they give. Samantha: 'Then we get our maths books 'cos we always have maths after sums on the board in the morning'; Jonathan: 'On the other days Miss reads us a story sometimes if she's got a story. You know a long one. Reads it in bits. The last one we had was *The Lion the Witch and the Wardrobe* which I've read about ten times and know nearly off by heart'.

Like all the other children, both generated more text in the oral mode than in the written and, as in their written narratives, both showed an ability to select appropriate content and to shape it to achieve an overall effect. However, the sense of a deliberately constructed overall plan is weaker in the oral texts, as the chronological sequence of the school day already provides the main framework. In both oral texts, too, we find a less varied pattern of linking and of organizing the information structure of the clause: 'I' or 'we' is the subject in the majority of main clauses and 'and' or 'and then' is the most frequent link between them. In certain respects, therefore, their oral texts are less satisfactory, as narratives, than those they wrote.

But that, of course, is to apply standards that are based on writing - standards, moreover, that most of the children would probably not even have recognized as applying to speech. However, even by these standards, several of the children' s accounts of the school day were quite effective. And it is probable that, if the topic had been less constraining in its strong demands for a chronological, 'and then', sequence, many of them would have been more successful. This is an issue which we intend to

address in future research.

**From Speech to Writing**

Considering both types of task together, now, we can see that there is a complex relationship b.tween speech and writing, both in the course of development and at any particular point in that development. In either mode, the production of a narrative monologue involves an interaction between children's control of the medium of expression - the form and substance - and their compositional abilities. Factors that will affect this interaction, in either mode, include their interest in the task, the availability of relevant content and appropriate discourse schemata, the specificity of their awareness of the knowledge of the prospective receiver and, of course, the pedagogical context.

What becomes progressively more important in distinguishing the two modes is the differing facilitations and constraints afforded by the actual processes of production and by the adjustments that the composer must make to take account of the different modes of reception. For both production and reception, the most important dimension on which the two modes differ is probably that of time. As Chafe (1982) has argued, the differing characteristic patterns in which information is organized in speech and writing can largely be accounted for in terms of the differing degrees of matching in the speed at which chunks of information can be processed via language by sender and receiver in the two modes. The relatively unlimited time available to the writer enormously facilitates the planning and revising aspects of composition, as compared with the constraint of having to keep going when composing in speech.

The second dimension of difference to which Chafe draws attention is that of 'involvement'. In the oral mode, even in monologue, the speaker can usually see his or her audience and receives continuous feedback, which subtly affects the ongoing planning at all levels. (Anyone who has tried to lecture to a television camera, as opposed to a 'live' audience, will attest to the importance of the human response, even though it be entirely non-verbal.) On the other hand, where the audience is absent and in addition often unknown, as in writing, there is little sense of inter-personal involvement. This difference in the sender-receiver relationship, when combined with the difference between the two modes in the availability of the prosodic and paralinguistic accompaniments to speech, affects not only the organization of the content in the two modes, but also the principles on which the content is selected. Although any general comparisons will need to be qualified for more specific sub-categories,

it is generally the case that, in writing, there is a relatively greater emphasis on logical structure, explicit marking of relationships, choice of more precise vocabulary, and so on. By comparison, in the oral mode there is a relatively greater concern to maintain solidarity with the listener, by remaining within the realm of the shared and familiar meanings and expression of conversation (cf. K. Goodman, this volume).

This differentiation of the modes of speaking and writing takes time to develop, of course, and it is only in the narratives of the most mature children, such as Jonathan, that it is clearly apparent. But, as it develops, we can recognize a parallel differentiation in the way in which the medium of expression interacts with the processes of composition. At this stage in our research, and aware of the very severe limitations of the data on which we have been working, we should very tentatively like to propose the following developmental sequence, emphasizing that it is based only on a study of children's spoken and written narratives. Whether it applies also to other forms of monologue still remains to be seen.

In the early stages, (that is, typically, at the beginning of schooling) the relatively well-developed control of speech allows the child to give his or her attention, in the production of oral monologue, to the task of composing, unhindered by the additional constraints of having to solve problems of expression. At this stage, therefore, we find some children producing quite complex oral narratives (Fox, 1983). However, the patterns of organization that underlie such monologues are not ideally suited to the development of the more complex compositional skills that are characteristic of writing. This requires a medium in which one can take stock of where one has got to and plan where one is going and which gives time to allow alternatives to be considered and revisions to be made. Furthermore, some degree of fluency and control of the substance and form of writing has to be achieved before the written medium can fulfill these requirements. Once this is the case, however, as for example with Samantha, we find that control of composition is more effectively manifested in the written than in the oral mode. At the still later stage of development illustrated by Jonathan, compositional skills developed through writing are drawn upon in the oral mode, allowing the speaker to generate a distinctive form, that of the spoken monologue.

Crucial to the later stages of this developmental progression, of course, is extensive experience of the written mode as a receiver, first in listening to stories read aloud and then as a reader oneself.

Where such experiences are lacking, children may gain control over the substance of the written mode, but have little facility in handling the other dimensions. Certainly, differences in the extent of such experiences, we have found, go a long way towards explaining why some children became much more successful writers than others (Wells, in press).

**Some Implications of this Investigation**

In keeping with the theme of this conference, this paper has focussed mainly on writing. At the present time, there is a renewed interest in writing, both amongst researchers and in schools and colleges. In our view, this is entirely to be welcomed; first, because of the opportunities for active, 'intentional' learning that are provided by the requirement to work on and transform one's knowledge and experience that any piece of sustained writing demands (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1982b); secondly, because of the individualized response from the reader/teacher that the resulting text is likely to elicit. For both these reasons, there is much to recommend a more prominent place being given to sustained writing in all subjects of the curriculum, particularly when the writing assignment grows naturally out of the other activities in which the pupils are engaged.

However, in concluding, we should like to make a plea for an equally important place being given to speech, particularly *sustained* speech by pupils. The arguments against allowing pupils to speak at any length are obvious - at least to some teachers: there is insufficient time, if the content of the curriculum is to be covered; what pupils have to say is often irrelevant, if not inaccurate; and, most dangerous of all, pupil talk is a threat to the teacher's control. Such arguments rest, of course, on a particular view of the relationship between learning and teaching which assumes that only teachers know and that their task is to transmit their knowledge to well-disciplined pupils with as little interference from the pupils' extra-curricular interests and experience as possible. The arguments against such a conception of education are also well-known and have been clearly and cogently stated in a number of places, notably by Barnes in *From Communication to Curriculum* (1976). These arguments are, in our view, correct.

Influenced by the spirit of the times, and by such develoment projects as *Communication Skills in Early Childhood* (Tough, 1977), few teachers now demand total silence in their classrooms, at least not in the primary years. However, this does not mean that pupil talk is seriously valued, as our longitudinal observations showed all too plainly (Wells, in press). Pupils are allowed to talk among

themselves when engaged in most activities and they are actively encouraged to respond to teachers' questions and to contribute to teacher-led discussions. But there are, according to our data, few classrooms in which pupils are given the opportunity to engage in sustained, task-oriented discussion with their peers or to speak at length on a topic on which, either inside or outside the school, they have acquired expertise.

There are several reasons for believing such opportunities for sustained oral production to be important. First, there is the impetus actively to work on and transform knowledge gained from their experience and research in order to make it meaningful to others. Secondly, there is the development of confidence in themselves as knowers and communicators that occurs when children are successfully able to present their knowledge to others. All of us who have to make conference presentations, such as the present one (when spoken), know how valuable the experience is in helping us to clarify and evaluate our ideas. We believe that the experiences, observations and responses of young children, too, can become more meaningful to them by being reflected on and reorganized for, and in the act of, telling. Equally important is the opportunity for peer response, both the discussion which aims at clarification and amplification and that which, through question and comment, provokes the speaker to think more deeply and carefully about what he or she has said.

In the present context, however, the advantage of oral monologue that we particularly wish to emphasize is that it provides an opportunity to develop some of the skills of composing - planning, selecting, marshalling and organizing ideas - that are so necessary for writing, and that it does so in a medium in which pupils feel more at ease and in which they are more likely to be successful.

**References**


Applebee, A. 1978. *The child's concept of story.* Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Barnes, D. 1976. *From communication to curriculum.* Harmondsworth. Middx.: Penguin.

Bereiter, C. and Scardamalia, M. 1982a. From conversation to composition: the role of instruction in a developmental process. In R. Glaser (ed.) *Advances in instructional psychology.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bereiter, C. and Scardamalia, M. 1982b. Schooling and the growth of intentional cognition: helping children take charge of their own minds. In Z. Lamm (ed.) *New trends in education.* Tel-Aviv: Yachdev.

Bereiter, C. and Scardamalia, M. 1985. Children's difficulties in learning to compose. In G. Wells and J. Nicholls (eds.) *Language and learning: an interactional perspective.* Lewes, E. Sussex: Falmer Press.

Bissex, G.L. 1980. *Gnys at wrk.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Britton, J. 1983. Writing and the story world. In B. Kroll and G. Wells (eds.) *Explorations in the development of writing.* Chichester: John Wiley.

Chafe, W. 1982. Integration and involvement in speaking, writing and oral literature. In D. Tannen (ed.) *Spoken and written language: exploring orality and literacy.* Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Clay, M. 1975. *What did I write?* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

de Beaugrande, R. 1982. Psychology and composition: past, present, and future. In M. Nystrand (ed.) *What writers know.* New York: Academic Press.

Farmer, I. and Dixon, J. 1981. *A policy for writers 9-12: Staging points in personal narrative.* Bretton Hall College. England.

Ferreiro, E. and Teberosky, A. 1982. (Spanish Version 1979) *Literacy before schooling.* Exeter, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Ferreiro, E. 1984. The underlying logic of literacy development. In H.Goelman, A. Oberg and F. Smith (eds.) *Awakening to literacy* Exeter, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Flower, L. and Hayes, J.R. 1980. The dynamics of composing: making plans and juggling constraints. In L.W.Greg and E.R.Steinberg (eds.) *Cognitive Processes in Writing.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Flower, L. and Hayes, J.R. 1981. A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32.* 4. pp. 365-387.

Fox, G. 1983. Talking like a book: young children's early narratives. In M. Meek (ed.) *Opening Moves.* Bedford Papers, 17. London: London University Institute for Education.

Goodman Y. 1984. The development of initial literacy. In H. Goelman, A.Oberg and F. Smith (eds.) *Awakening to literacy.* Exeter, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Goody, J. 1977. *The domestication of the savage mind.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graves, D. 1982. *Writing: teachers and children at work.* Exeter, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Gumperz, J.C. and Gumperz, J.J. 1981. From oral to written culture: the transition to literacy. In M.F. Whiteman (ed.) *Writing: Variation in writing. Vol. 1.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hardy, B. 1968. Towards a poetic of fiction: an approach through narrative. In *Novel: a forum on fiction.* Brown University.

Harste, J., Woodward, V. and Burke, C. 1984. *Language stories and literacy lessons.* Exeter, N.H.:

Heinemann Educational Books.

Kroll, B. and Anson, C. 1983. Analysing structure in children's fictional narrative. In H. Cowie (ed.) *The development of children's imaginative writing.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kroll, B.M. and Vann, R.J. (eds.) 1981. *Exploring speaking-writing relationships: connections and contrasts.* Urbana. Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Mandler, J.M. and Johnson, N.C. 1977. Remembrance of things parsed: story structure and recall. *Cognitive Psychology. 9.* pp.111-51.

Martlew, M. 1983. Problems and difficulties: cognitive and communicative aspects of writing. In M. Martlew (ed.) *The psychology of written language.* Chichester: John Wiley.

Meek, M. 1985. Play and paradoxes: some considerations of imagination and language. In G. Wells and J. Nicholls (eds.) *Language and learning: an interactional perspective.* Lewes, East Sussex: Falmer Press.

Nicholls, J.C. (ed.) 1984. *The beginning writing enquiry.* University of East Anglia.

Olson, D.R. 1977. From utterance to text: the bias of language in speech and writing. *Harvard Educational Review. 47.* pp.257-281.

Rosen, C. and Rosen, H. 1973. *The language of primary school children.* Harmondsworth, Middx.: Penguin.

Smith, F. 1982. *Writing and the writer.* New York: Holt Rinehart.

Tannen, D. (ed.) 1982. *Spoken and written language: exploring orality and literacy.* Norwood. N.J.: Ablex.

Tannen, D. (ed.) 1984. *Coherence in spoken and written discourse.* Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Tough, J. 1977. *The development of meaning.* London: Unwin Educational Books.

Vygotsky, L.S. 1978. *Mind in society.* Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wade, B. 1981. *Story at home and school.* Educational Review Occasional Publications Number Ten. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Wells, C.G. 1981. Some antecedents of early educational attainment. *British Journal of Education. 2.* 2. pp.181-200.

Wells, C.G. 1985. *Language development in the pre-school years.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wells, C.G. (in press.) *The meaning makers.* Exeter, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Wells, C.G., Barnes, S. and Wells, J. 1984. *Linguistic influences on educational attainment.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Wilkinson, A.: Barnsley, G.: Hanna, P. and Swan, M. 1980. *Assessing language development.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

once upon a time there is a giraffe in the jungle and there is a snake in the jungle but there is a elephant in the jungle the End

Text 1.

at christmas my mum bought me a bike at chistmas my mum bought me a wireless and a colouring Book

Text 2.

One day a hunter was hunting for lions and he whet into the jungle. He was being chased buy a rhino and a lion and monkeys snakes elephant bird and tortoises The hunter shouted help. The hunter fired a pilet but it was sud with blags. The hunter came to a died end so the hunter jumpd off the cliff. We dont no waat haperd to the hunter

Text 3.

My happyes monet is when I haed my bike it and the bike was a boxes it made me bagg because I can do jumps on it

Text 4.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 1.

Cartoon for the story of the Hunter

Appendix 2.

Observed Progression in the Development of Children's Narrative Writing (c.f. Fig. 2)

| RHETORICAL GOALS | | CONTENT | | FORM | | SUBSTANCE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall Purpose | Awareness of Reader | Affective/ Moral Structure | Ideation (Narrative Structure) | Grammar | Vocabulary | Punctuation | Spelling | Handwriting |
| -Clear plan<br>-Summarizes<br>-Evidence of intended effect<br>-Evaluates | -Shows awareness of reader's state of knowledge<br>-Explains<br>-Asides to reader | -Implicit affect. response<br>-Explicit affect. response<br>-Affect. response motivates action<br>-Empathy<br>-Simple moral<br>-Self-awareness<br>-Expresses ambivalence | -2 or more events in chronol. sequence<br>-Beginning/ending<br>-Causal links made explicit<br>-Setting provided<br>-Clear motivation of action<br>-Climax/resolution<br>-Characterization<br>-Nested episodes<br>-Character drives plot | -Simple active declarative sentences<br>-Varied sentences<br>-Dependent clauses<br>-Relative clauses<br>-Pronominal cohesion<br>-Clausal cohesion<br>-Concord of tenses<br>-Controls choice of sentence type for effect | -Basic vocabulary only<br>-Uses common modifiers<br>-Selects some less common verbs<br>-Uses adverbs<br>-Selects verbs with manner component<br>-Varied and effective selection of vocabulary | -Marks major meaning boundaries<br>-Periods and capitals at sentence boundaries<br>-Question marks<br>-Exclamation marks<br>-Quotation marks<br>-Commas<br>-Paragraphing | -Salient sounds only<br>-All sounds<br>-Consonants correct<br>-Phonetically consistent<br>-Mainly conventional<br>-Accurate except for occasional errors | -Idiosyncratic letter shapes<br>-Conventional letter shapes<br>-Spaces between words<br>-Upper and lower case used appropriately<br>-Prints legible<br>-Cursive writing |

Note The progression is to be read as occurring from top to bottom within categories.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE